



Rycroft, E. (2017). Place on the late medieval and early modern stage: The case of *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis*. *Shakespeare Bulletin*, 35(2), 247-266. <https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.2017.0016>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1353/shb.2017.0016](https://doi.org/10.1353/shb.2017.0016)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the final published version of the article (version of record). It first appeared online via Johns Hopkins University at <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/662744>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

Place on the Late Medieval and Early Modern Stage: The Case of *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis*

ELEANOR RYCROFT
University of Bristol

Place and space theory has now been applied widely throughout early modern studies to unlock such diverse areas as embodiment, cultural geography, poetry, performance, and politics. Its theoretical application across the disciplines of history, history of art, theater studies, English literature, and geography demonstrates the interdisciplinary potential of the “spatial turn.”¹ At the heart of place and space theory—evident from its genesis in the works of Gaston Bachelard and Yi-Fu Tuan through to its most recent concern with placelessness in the digital age—is an assumption that space is an empty container, while place is a locale. Space is thus normatively constructed as amorphous, changeable, and malleable, while place is seen as fixed, bounded, or nameable. As Tuan puts it, “What begins as undifferentiated space becomes place as we get to know it better and endow it with value” (6). Tim Cresswell points out that the usual distinction between place and space is reversed, however, in Michel de Certeau’s influential work, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, in which he construes the place of the city turned *into* space through the tactical maneuvers of its inhabitants. As Cresswell writes, “To de Certeau place is the empty grid over which practice occurs while space is what is created by practice Practice is thus a tactical art that plays with the structures of place that are provided” (38-39).

However place and space are conceptualized, the way in which practice contributes to their definition is fundamental. As Allan Pred has argued, place must be used by social actors in order to attain meaning and so exists in a continual mode of becoming: “Place is what takes place ceaselessly, what contributes to history in a specific context through the creation and utilization of a physical setting” (279). Performance theorists such as Mike Pearson and cultural

geographers such as Tim Ingold unite across their disciplines to demonstrate that it is experience that defines place. Their insights are especially important for the fields of practice-based research (PbR) and practice-as-research (PaR), and fundamentally inform the AHRC-funded projects with which I have been involved: “Staging the Henrician Court” (Oxford Brookes University, 2008-10) which staged John Heywood’s *The Play of the Weather* in the Great Hall of Hampton Court Palace, and “Staging and Representing the Scottish Renaissance Court” (University of Edinburgh, 2012-14), which staged Sir David Lyndsay’s *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis* in the grounds of Linlithgow Palace.²

The ideas of Pred, Cresswell, Pearson, and Ingold accord very well with PbR in historic locations such as these insofar as the sites are reoriented through performance into places of “theater” rather than “heritage,” emphasizing that how we define “place” depends upon what occurs within it. While the performances at the heart of these projects drew meaning from their historical surroundings, they reciprocally helped to illuminate the ways in which place is “an event rather than a secure ontological thing rooted in notions of the authentic” (Cresswell 39). The marriage of a creative research practice with the built environments of Hampton Court’s Great Hall and Linlithgow Palace thus illustrated how practice works to construct meaning; both plays reactivated significances in the historic buildings and their surroundings that lay dormant prior to their performance, at the same time as their significance was enriched and nourished by the buildings in or beside which they were staged.³ In the final part of this article, the 2013 performance of *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis* will be used as a case study to consider the relationship between site, place, and performance in PbR projects based in historic sites in greater detail. However, in order to demonstrate how this relationship might work, it is first necessary to establish how the concept of “place” informs the dramaturgies of the late medieval and early modern stages.

Place in Early English Theater

Narratives of theater historiography that construct the opening of the Red Lion in 1567 as the origin of early modern drama belie the extent to which playhouse practices were informed by a rich heritage of theater performed in public spaces such as innyards, churchyards, amphitheaters such as the *plen an gwari* of Cornwall, communal spaces such as the streets and civic areas appropriated for festivity, as well as in private houses, inns of court, castles, and palaces. In fact, the plays of Shakespeare and his contemporaries both employ and exploit an extant theatrical vocabulary to articulate their uses of the stage. Robert Weimann has demonstrated as much with his work on manifestations of *locus* and *platea* sites in the Elizabethan and Jacobean theater (see the introduction of this special issue). While Weimann's theories have been usefully challenged and revised in recent scholarship—including by Clare Wright in this special issue, who contends that the distinction Weimann makes between play worlds and real worlds is fundamentally at odds with the dramaturgical legacy of medieval theatre—it is nevertheless possible to detect a hybridity of presentational and representational space at work in Shakespeare, most marked when those spaces operate concurrently. For instance, in act three, scene 3 of *Othello*, the title character remains in the action while Iago steps in and out of the scene to address the audience:

IAG. The Moor already changes with my poison:

Dangerous conceits are, in their natures, poisons.

Which at the first are scarce found to distaste,

But with a little act upon the blood.

Burn like the mines of Sulphur. I did say so:

Look where he comes!

Enter OTHELLO

Not poppy, nor mandragora,
Nor all the drowsy syrups of the world,
Shall ever medicine thee to that sweet sleep
Which thou owedst yesterday.
OTH. Ha! ha! false to me?
IAG. Why, how now, general! no more of that. (3.3.330-40)

A residual performative spatial organization inheres in moments such as these; an understanding that Iago can address an audience on “Look where he comes!”—with space left in the verse lines between “comes!” and “Not poppy” for the character and audiences’ shared observation of Othello’s agitated state—but within a mere few lines, can leave his position of objectivity to rejoin Othello in Cyprus on “Why, how now, general?”

Whether this is a literal shifting of position or more of a rhetorical shift is unclear, however. Scenes dense with asides or moments of direct address challenge a spatial shift, such as De Flores’s exclamation in *The Changeling*, “Her fingers touched me! / She smells all amber” (2.2.82-83), which requires the actor to be close enough to be touched by Beatrice but also to be able to address the audience. Indeed, throughout this exchange De Flores is simultaneously experiencing and commenting upon the dramatic activity, lending credence to Erika T. Lin’s observation that one of the qualities of the *platea* character is their ability to overhear without being overheard (291-92). In this way, the *platea* of the early modern stage is less a physical space than a rhetorical strategy or mode of speaking; the ability to slip seamlessly, if not spatially, between presentational and representational modes of performance.

And yet the place, or *platea*, is certainly a primary category for organizing the theatrical space of the earliest English drama. Indeed, there is a concern, particularly in the openings of late-fifteenth- and early-sixteenth-century plays, to establish and secure the boundaries of the

platea, dictated by their performance in ad hoc, non-professional, and temporary spaces of theatrical activity. There is thus a special emphasis in early English drama on delineating the “theater” itself, with performers verbally producing the *platea* as a performance space.⁴ When actors invoke the word “place” on their entrances, they therefore refer as much to the area being transformed into theatrical space, as to the fictional places that they are creating. Perseverance generates the stage when he says in *Hick Scorner*, “Now to this place hither come I am” (line 93), as does Humility when he welcomes the titular protagonist of *Youth*, “Ye be welcome to this place here” (line 597), or, in the same interlude, when Pride tells Charity, “Lightly see thou avoid the place” (640). This instance echoes a moment earlier in the play when Youth has said to Charity, “Hence, knave, out of this place / Or I shall lay thee on the face!” (85-86). In these examples, the use of the word “place” serves to highlight the area in which the audience are located—the site-specific venue of the Great Hall, guildhall, churchyard, innyard—but also attempts to prize the space away from its usual designation and reproduce it as a site of performance, both marked out from and in this environment. The simultaneity of actual and representational space helps to account for the preponderance of the word “place” on entrances and exits particularly, as characters attempt to define the performance site’s boundaries. While all performance is “bracketed activity,” according to Pearson, with “a demarcated beginning and end,” the impetus to bracket is heightened in site-specific performance because “At site and within the continuum of the everyday, [performance] may need to work harder to distinguish itself, to indicate that it comes into being” (141).

However, the use of performative utterance to carve out theatrical space in late medieval drama is complicated by the fact that “‘stage’ space is seldom imagined as a particular fictional *location*” (Twycross 69). In *Mankind*, for instance, Titivillus directs Newguise on his return to “bring your advantage to this place” (line 524), but means the tavern yard in which the performance is occurring rather than any imaginary setting. Meg Twycross has further

demonstrated that rather than attempting to overwrite the surroundings in which performance occurs, pre-modern non-professional players rather “draw attention to them” (70). When staging *The Play of the Weather* at Hampton Court, it became clear that the audience’s awareness of the Great Hall was a facet of performance exploited with great subtlety and sophistication by Heywood, who, for example, has Merry Report inveigle an actual rather than fictive torch-bearer from the audience into his play: “Brother, holde your torche a lytell hyer!” (line 98). Twycross shows that not only are the audience occasionally players, but also that characters, such as A and B in *Fulgens and Lucres*, are occasionally audience (75). Nevertheless, there is still a doubling in which two places exist simultaneously, the innyard or Great Hall that has been appropriated for performance *and* the performance space that is sometimes layered on top of it—as when, in *Weather*, the Boy invokes the banqueting audience (and perhaps even Henry VIII) by acknowledging that Jupiter has come “This nyght to suppe here wyth my lorde” (1027)—or that attempts to replace it with a fictional location such as *Hick Scorner’s* London or *Fulgens and Lucres’s* Rome. Even when there is no difference between the real and represented locations, the repeated use of the word “place” still reveals a concern to remake the venue into a site of representation; a *platea* operating sometimes alongside and sometimes in distinction to the performance space.

Of course, the doubling or layering of space in early drama is equally true of performances conducted in playhouses. However, Pearson suggests that while “In the auditorium one thing of singular importance is happening,” at non-theatrical sites “many things may be happening: performance may need to establish and proclaim its own presence” (17). In early theater, then, there may be varying densities of place-as-place or place-as-performance space invoked at different times during the drama, and the audience might be asked to oscillate between real and represented locales depending upon where they are positioned dramaturgically. When Free Will says, “Beshrew him for me that is last out of this place!”

(*Hick Scorer*, 544-45), we can assume that the audience is not included in his command, despite occupying the same locale as the characters; that the “place” here is theatrical rather than real, the *platea* rather than a dining hall. And yet the *platea* is so often elided with the place of performance that early theater is sometimes forced to define its spatial limits, in order to determine, or play with, where the performance space begins and where it ends.

The construction of theatrical space occurs through stage directions as well as speech. In the Croxton *Play of the Sacrament* the reader is told, “*Here shall þe lechys man come into þe place sayng*” (line 524 SD), and on many occasions in the Digby *Mary Magdelene* play *platea* action is specified, for instance, “*Here xal Satan go hom to hys stage, and Mari xal entyr into þe place alone, save þe Bad Angyl*” (line 564 SD).⁵ That all of these references to “the place” indicate a central playing space when such plays are performed in amphitheaters is confirmed by the place-and-scaffold staging images contained in the manuscripts of *Bewnans Meriasek* and *The Castle of Perseverance*. In the latter, how to use the central playing place is richly explicated through detailed stage directions. While the evidence for the positioning of audience in place-and-scaffold theaters is conflicting,⁶ if the audience *is* seated on the *platea* rather than at the edges of the amphitheater, the stage directions of *The Castle of Perseverance* demonstrate the extent to which this central space was remarkably fluid area of performance and non-performance potentially shared by audiences and actors alike: “*Backbiter enters into the place*” (490 SD, emphasis added); “*Mankind descends from the World's scaffold to Backbiter, and together they begin to move across the place to Greediness's scaffold*” (632 SD, emphasis added); “*Pride, Wrath, and Envy descend from Belial's scaffold to the place*” (800 SD, emphasis added); “*Penance enters into the place and travels across it to Greediness' scaffold as she speaks*” (1220 SD, emphasis added).

An effort to define the *platea* highlights the fact that the earliest drama always occurs within a place with a dominant, non-theatrical function. There is therefore the possibility of

spatial collapse, the shadow of the possibility that the audience will leave the “place” with Free Will. In fixed playhouses, theatrical space is always already doubled—Elsinore is at once a castle and the stage of the Globe—but in late medieval and early-sixteenth-century drama, that doubleness is redoubled in that the venue of performance also carries the meanings produced by its workaday function. It is simultaneously a real place, sometimes a represented place, and always a constructed *platea*, or theatrical place, and, as critics from T. W. Craik to Janette Dillon have shown, dramatists exploit such site-specificity. However, the aesthetic and cultural associations of the dining hall also threaten to overwhelm the drama, and the slippage between the venue of performance and the temporary theatrical place is amplified by the identical terminology, making it unclear in descriptions of the 1527 Greenwich entertainment, for instance, whether the “place” invoked when the “Maskers tooke Ladies and daunsed lustily about the place,” or “sodenly the kyng and the viscount of Torayne were conveighed out of the place” (Hall 724), is at these moments a performance space or Great Hall.

The securing of the *platea* is partly necessary to ensure that the audience has understood what constitutes the stage and will not overrun it. In *Hick Scorer*, for instance, performers attempt to clear the theatrical space of non-performers, with Free Will saying, “Aware, fellows, and stand a-room!” (156). The lack of a spatially-segregated stage necessitates its linguistic production: being a theater means saying you are one, but the dissolution of your boundaries is a continuous peril. This is not to suggest a teleology in which the English theater was moving ever forwards towards a professional stage, or that early dramatists’ conventional appropriation of place was anything other than carefree, confident, and skillful; indeed, the dissolution of boundaries was, as shown by *Fulgens and Lucres*, frequently a desired dramatic effect. However, it is to draw attention to a dramatic legacy of place-making inherited by the professional stage of the late sixteenth-century stemming from the overlapping of performance space and real life in earlier drama, for which there was “no special provision for staging” and

during which “the audience encroached on the acting space,” resulting in the drama’s embroilment in a “metatheatrical game: the players treat the audience as if they and the characters were in the same world” (Twycross 70-72).

Nevertheless, compared to the late medieval and early Tudor drama, and despite the codes of space exercised in a play like *Othello*, the word “place” itself appears relatively little in Shakespeare’s works as a means of invoking the stage. A key exception is the Chorus in *Henry V*, who asks the audience’s pardon that “a crooked figure may/ Attest in little place a million” (Pro.15-16). Yet, even in an early play such as *The Comedy of Errors*, the collisions and divisions of space that operate in late medieval drama are increasingly separated, as when Emilia issues her invitation at the end of the play:

Renowned duke, vouchsafe to take the pains
To go with us into the abbey here
And hear at large discoursed all our fortunes;
And all that are assembled in this place,
That by this sympathised one day's error
Have suffer'd wrong, go, keep us company. (5.1.393-98)

Contrary to a conflated sense of place potentially inhabited by both performer and spectator, “this place” in Emilia’s speech directs those on stage to an offstage area from which the audience are excluded. Emilia’s lines effect Ephesus as an imaginary space that belongs solely to those in the realm of the play, whilst also alluding to the tiring house inaccessible to the audience. The moment has an interesting antecedent in the Croxton play which culminates, as David Bevington points out, in the audience and actors singing together as they process to the church, an event which not only resists distinctions between spaces of theater and religion, but

also differences between spectator and performer (755, 37-8). Conversely at the end of *The Comedy of Errors*, the spectators are encouraged to imagine that they might join the actors, only to be made aware that this is impossible given the reconfiguration and segregation of theater space.

A reduced need to demarcate performative space from places with alternative everyday functions (such as dining halls), or from outdoor *plateas* which constitute a shared space of acting and non-acting (as in place-and-scaffold drama), means that “place” comes increasingly to be used in a social rather than spatial sense in Shakespeare, even when physicalized at such moments as Banquo’s ghost taking Macbeth’s place at the banquet. Thus in plays from *Coriolanus* to *Macbeth* to *Hamlet*, the word “place” comes primarily to mean degree or rank. Unsurprisingly, perhaps, the use of the word “place” in a spatial rather than metaphorical sense intensifies during the encounter with the amateur performers of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*. As Weimann has argued, these performers are invested in a presentational rather than representational form of acting, and their medieval theatricality is reinforced by Peter Quince’s connection of their activities with the *platea*: “Pat, pat; and here's a marvelous convenient place for our rehearsal. This green plot shall be our stage, this hawthorn-brake our tiring-house” (3.1.2-4). Place here is not just a rehearsal area; Quince evokes the communal greens appropriated for performance by late medieval playing troupes. But it is during the rude mechanicals’ performance as well as their rehearsals that the term “place” reanimates the theatrical entity of the *platea*, for example, when Snout warns the ladies not to be scared of the lion: “For if I should as lion come in strife / Into this place, 'twere pity on my life” (5.1.220-21). The term recurs in Titania’s epilogic blessing when she says, “Hand in hand, with fairy grace / Will we sing, and bless this place” (5.1.385-86). While, of course, epilogues are speeches more associated with Weimann’s spatial thresholds, her spell arguably encompasses the immediate environs of the audience as well as the imaginary environs of Athens, and so

instantiates an earlier conception of a theatrical *platea* as that shared by both spectator and performer.

This earlier sense of place as *platea* makes sense in terms of the amateur performances of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, but the overwhelming tendency is for “place” to be deployed in a more figurative sense in Shakespeare’s plays. An exemption to this thesis, however, is *Othello*, which fixates upon the word in a way which fuses its locational and social dimensions, as when Othello asserts that “Cassio shall have my place” (4.1.257), meaning both his job and his bed. It is noteworthy that a play which, as I have noted, blends presentational and representational space to the extent that *Othello* does, should have the one of the highest concentrations of the use of the word “place” in Shakespeare’s canon.⁷ The fact remains, however, that deploying the word “place” to demarcate the stage itself occurs rarely in Shakespeare’s plays, despite the medieval spatial vocabulary sometimes detectible within them.

Place in *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis*

The final section of this article will apply some of these ideas about the *platea* directly to the “Staging the Scottish Court” project in order to think about the construction of place in practice-based research. Any practice-based project that attempts to reconstruct late medieval and early modern drama should be attentive to the organizing spatial principles of *locus* and *platea*, remain sensitive to references to “place” in the text, and must consider how set design in either built environments or outdoor spaces facilitates the creation of a fluid and flexible *platea* area. I intend to demonstrate the importance of thinking spatially by using the 2013 production of *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis* as a case study for the complexities of the *platea* and to account for how these were addressed during our production. The *Satyre* is a particularly significant play as it is poised on a number of thresholds, not least the tipping point between

late medieval allegorical drama and the early modern professional stage. It is a play deeply invested in the idea of borders; national, cultural, political, and generic, as well as spatial. On this occasion, however, my analysis will focus on Lyndsay's use of space and place, and how he responds to the issue of theatrical boundary-making explored in the first half of the article. A key concern will be access to the performance space itself.

Transgressions of bounded *platea* space in medieval and earlier sixteenth-century theater develop Weimann's notion of the *platea* as a unilateral effect insofar as characters inhabiting stage thresholds speak outwards to the audience. A key early modern exception to this sense of theatrical energy emanating from the stage is to be found in the Citizen and his Wife from *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*. However, this peculiarly powerful instance of boundary-crossing in the Jacobean drama has a prototype not only in *Fulgens and Lucres*, but also in *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis*, a play performed at Cupar in 1552 and Edinburgh in 1554. Written by a poet, herald, and nobleman at the Stewart court, it is a drama intrinsically concerned with the spatial politics of government, and the 2013 performance of *Satyre* helped to reveal the text's commentary on the performativity of power among the Scottish political classes. The staging of *Satyre* was site-specific in that the performance venue—built on the public park known as The Peel—existed in a symbolic and symbiotic relationship with the Palace of Linlithgow that rose behind it. As a former royal residence of James V, Linlithgow Palace accorded very well with the discursive field of the text and its concern with sovereign, parliamentary, aristocratic and ecclesiastical sources of power. However, the first of these emerged as especially significant in terms of the relationship between historic site and performance, as the Palace was also the birthplace of both James V and Mary Queen of Scots, during whose reigns Lyndsay was writing, and where he spent a good deal of his life as childhood companion and trusted courtier to James.

[Insert Fig. 1]

In the grounds beside a palace pivotal to this period of Scottish rule we constructed a theater-in-the-round in which to stage Lyndsay's play. When the audience was seated on the ground facing the main stage, the Palace seemed to grow out of the set, suggesting contiguity between the space of the theater and the seat of Stewart power. Pearson cites Fiona Wilkie to show how places act as "'containers' (of memories, stories and legends), as 'aggregations of metaphorical and physical layers,'" but also claims that they are palimpsestic, simultaneously invoking as they overwrite meaning through performance (55). Our site-specific staging drew unmistakable historical resonance from its palatial backdrop but was also situated in a liminal, green space beyond the Palace, enabling comment upon the royal residence through the spatial distancing of a play undoubtedly concerned with the legitimacy and basis of power. The siting of the performance thus both stabilized and destabilized the text; its situation alongside but outside the Palace was apt for a play which critically represents and potentially undermines monarchical authority.

In his article for *The Hare*, Robert Shaughnessy wisely criticizes the impetus in early modern practice-based research to reconstruct original playing spaces as a way of "solving" the text, urging that space is only one aspect of the theatrical matrix that helps researchers to understand early dramatic texts and not the determining factor. Criticizing what he sees as the spatial determinism of Shakespeare's Globe, he writes, "What we have here is a radical form of site-specificity that, however much it has encouraged a rethinking of performer and spectator behavior, is implicated within a reductive form of literalism." The danger is that practice-based research enacts a form of theatrical essentialism by purporting to find the authentic performance through the authentic performance venue, without remaining attentive to the historicity of performance practices themselves. And yet performing in original or authentic

spaces and places also undeniably raises questions that aren't readily imaginable without this particular research methodology. It was only through staging *Weather* in Hampton Court, for instance, that the research team became so keenly aware of the complex politics of admittance in the play. The need to find concrete performance solutions for the many lines concerning who stood where, when and how, sharpened the researchers' focus on aspects of the text easily overlooked during reading, and in ways which illuminated contemporaneous historic documents such as the Eltham Ordinances with their anxiety about orderliness and decorum at court.

In the case of *Satyre*, the fact that there was no record of the original staging configuration meant that we were able to resist spatial determinism to a degree. The theater-in-the-round built for the performance was heavily influenced by three specific images: *The Castle of Perseverance* drawing, the image of a theatrum from the Terence des Duc manuscript, as well as Jean Fouquet's picture of "The Martyrdom of St Apollonia." While the influence of French models on the genre and form of the play might point to a more linear model of staging (best demonstrated by the image of the Passion play at Valenciennes), and while there are methodological issues associated with the images on which our stage was based,⁸ the research team decided that the enclosed circular space materialized the *Satyre*'s fundamental principle that the whole of Scotland—from her poorest subject to her most powerful—should be involved in the reform of the country. For in part two of the *Satyre*, in a parliament enacted before the audience's eyes, the characters of Pauper and Johne the Common-Weill make complaints about the injustices meted out to the working class that propel the social, ecclesiastical, and legal reforms staged during the play. The theater-in-the-round became a key way of organizing the audience into a "little Scotland," a microcosm of the nation seated on the *platea*, the theatrical boundaries standing for the national boundaries by which they were enclosed.

Lyndsay augments his critique of power in part two by representing spatial governmental practices peculiar to the Scottish system, such as the procession of the Three Estates into the space of the parliament—the so-called “Riding of the Parliament”—and the fencing of that space. Such overt representations of political ceremony reveal the extent to which the parliament was itself performed and performative; this was especially true of a Scottish parliament which could happen in a variety of different locations, so was dependent upon such quasi-theatrical practices to authorize it as a seat of government. In *Satyre*, however, the disordered state of the realm is signified by the subversion of the “Riding” and the fact that in Lyndsay’s version the Estates process backwards, to the chagrin of King Rex Humanitas: “Backwart? Backwart? How may that be?” (2341). Furthermore, the staging of the “fencing of the parliament”—a solemn roping-off of the parliamentarians to signify the start of the assembly for which Lyndsay, in his role as Lyon King of Arms, would have been personally responsible⁹—demonstrates the extent to which access to political space is restricted. The representation of such governmental practices reveals that it is the political processes occurring behind closed doors that Lyndsay aims to make transparent for his audience. But they also show how the production of the Scottish parliament was remarkably close to the production of the performance in non-playhouse space. The place of parliament was created through processes analogous to the establishment of the theatrical *platea* and, as I will show, was subject to the same ostensible threats, invasions and requirements to enclose and manage its boundaries.

[Insert Fig. 2.]

By staging our production in the round, we were able to do various things with space to signify both the openness and foreclosure of political access. Upon entering the performance

space the audience may have become the commonwealth of Scotland, but they were also spatially distinguished from the political powers by a “stank” or ditch that demarcated them from the actors, as well as through activities such as the fencing. Such boundaries are transgressed in the playtext, however, by the representatives of the audience—Pauper and Johne the Common-weill—when Johne jumps over the ditch separating him from the political class, for instance (2437 SD), but also when the Pauper first enters the playing space, in a critical moment of the play. Repeated reference is made in the *Satyre* to the “feild”—the play’s version of the *platea*—out of which not only Pauper and Johne but also a number of other characters emerge. It is often said that Vices appear from amongst the audience in medieval plays to remind the audience of their proximity to wickedness,¹⁰ but the uses of space in the *Satyre* reverse this formula. The “feild” served in our recreation of the play as the place where the interests of the commonweal were represented, functioning more usually as a space of virtue than vice, whether allegorically embodied in Chastitie, symbolized by the Pauper and Johne, or attributed to hardworking laborers such as the Taylour. It was from this place that virtuous characters, as if they were members of the audience, addressed the characters on stage from among them, producing a dialogic *platea* space, the audience as a virtuous body, and attributing worth to unlikely characters such as Pauper.

As Greg Walker has argued in an article informed by this production, Lyndsay’s Pauper is no allegory. This is a man who is very much located in terms of place—he lives exactly one mile from Tranent (1969)—who explains that he has sunk into poverty from a position of self-sufficiency because of the self-interest of the clergy and aristocracy. So low has he sunk that he can no longer play games of rank and status, and he breaks spatial decorum to occupy the king’s throne at the top of the stage and drink his wine: “*Heir sall the Carle clim up and sit in the Kings tchyre*” (1949 SD). In doing so, he vertically ascends from the lowest rung of society to the highest—from *platea* to *sedes*—by contravening the hierarchical vocabulary of the stage

space, resulting in Diligence's threat, "Loup down or, be the gude Lord, thow sall los thy heid" (1956). It becomes clear that not only is he unwelcome in the usurped space of royalty, however, but also that he is not welcome in the playing space altogether.¹¹ At a moment when Diligence has announced the interval and encouraged the audience to go and find refreshments, the Pauper makes a surprise entrance. Diligence exclaims:

Quhair [Where] have wee gottin this gudly companyeoun?

Swyith out of the feild, fals raggit loon!

God wait gif [if] heir be ane weill keipit [well-kept] place.

Quhen sic [When such] a vile beggar carle may get entres

Fy on yow, officiars, that mends nocht thir failyies [faults]!

...

Without ye cum and chase this carle away,

The Devill *a word yeis get mair of our play [you'll hear no more of the play]! (1938-45)

Lyndsay effectively dramatizes a stage invasion, an infiltration of the playing space by someone deemed too poor and beggarly to inhabit it. The place or "feild" has not been well-guarded; an official has failed in their duty to ensure a certain class of audience member. The mini-Scotland created by the theater-in-the-round proves not as inclusive as it had first appeared in part one; its boundaries are redrawn against an intruder. Lyndsay's play thus serves not just as a critique of the inaccessible nature of parliament, but of the theater itself, which is suddenly transformed into a private enclosure. In renegotiating the boundaries organizing the space of performance during the performance, Lyndsay demonstrates Henri Lefebvre's contention that "every spatial envelope implies a barrier between inside and out, but that this barrier is always relative and, in the case of membranes, always permeable" (176). Notably, to

stage this irruption into the *platea* during the 2013 production, we had to break with our own practice of historical costuming and put the character into modern dress in order to achieve Lyndsay's desired effect of incursion.

[Insert Fig. 3]

De Certeau's theory of strategies and tactics in *The Practice of Everyday Life* helps to illuminate Pauper's invasion of the stage and the uses of the *platea* in this play, and perhaps in medieval and early modern theater more widely. He writes:

I call a "strategy" the calculus of force-relationships which becomes possible when a subject of will and power (a proprietor, an enterprise, a city, a scientific institution) can be isolated from an "environment". A strategy assumes a place that can be circumscribed as *proper* (*propre*) and thus serve as the basis for generating relations with an exterior distinct from it.

...

I call a "tactic," on the other hand, a calculus which cannot count on a "proper" (a spatial or institutional localization), nor thus on a borderline distinguishing the other as a visible totality. The place of the tactic belongs to the other. A tactic insinuates itself into the other's place, fragmentarily, without taking over in its entirety, without being able to keep it at a distance. (xix)

The "tactic" thus corresponds well with the invocations of theatrical "place" in medieval and early sixteenth-century drama and how actors temporarily reoriented extant places for performance purposes, but also specifically with the actions of Pauper when he occupies the "place proper" of the King's throne, and further when he infiltrates the "place proper" of the performance space on his entrance. While, for the majority of the play, the "feild" enables tactical performance, serving as the space from which characters who represent the audience

can emerge through them to address the “place proper” of court or parliament on the raised circular stage, when the Pauper enters the playing space the theater-in-the-round itself transforms into another circumscribed and exclusive “place proper” as described by de Certeau. It is the base from which Diligence can generate a relationship with a character exterior to its boundaries; a Pauper who has tactically invaded and momentarily changed the nature of the *platea*, transforming it from the theatrical “feild” into an actual field where a beggar might be found. The moment thus serves as another instance of the simultaneity of the fictive and real which early playwrights were so adept at manipulating as a dramaturgical strategy.

De Certeau goes on to write that “the ‘proper’ is a victory of space over time. On the contrary, because it does not have a place, a tactic depends on time—it is always on the watch for opportunities that must be seized ‘on the wing’” (xix). And indeed the Pauper seizes the opportunity of a suspension of time during the proclaimed theatrical interval to beg for money, but Lyndsay, too, seizes this suspension, as a dramatist, to unsettle the boundary between the play and non-play, between actor and character, between generic convention and improvisation, and in our version, it transpired, between historical authenticity and contemporary costuming, to achieve a moment of supreme disturbance to theatrical time and space. The success of the depicted infiltration and invasion not only justifies the theater-in-the-round staging used, it suggests that how appropriate this form of staging is if theatermakers want to produce Lyndsay’s desired effect of a Pauper intruding upon structures of power, place and play effectively.

More generally, the projects of “Staging the Henrician Court” and “Staging the Scottish Court” show that when reconstructing early performance space, a particular sensitivity to the notion of place, in terms of both its theatrical legacy and its relationship to the politics of performance, is fundamental to activating the political echoes buried in rarely-performed dramas. Whether the literal place of late medieval and early-sixteenth-century theater, or a fluid

space sublimated into a mode of speaking by the seventeenth century, determining the function of the *platea* remains a crux for unlocking the spatial politics that organize late medieval and early modern drama.

Notes

The insights gleaned from PbR, like the research itself, are frequently the result of collaboration, and I wish to acknowledge the input of Tom Betteridge, Greg Thompson, and Greg Walker, as well as the many actors involved in both “Staging the Henrician Court” and “Staging the Scottish Court.” All of the people involved in these projects have made fundamental contributions to my thinking and, without them, this article could not have been conceived or written. I am also grateful to Clare Wright for her invaluable comments on an earlier draft.

¹ See, for example, Dillon; Fitzpatrick; Gordon and Klein; Massey; Sanders; Stock.

² I prefer to use practice-based research to describe these projects because each produced hypothetical performances which were then the subject of further critical writing and reflection. However, the research findings were as much captured and disseminated through the performances as they were through further scholarship.

³ To view films of these performances, please visit the project websites (see Works Cited).

⁴ While the word “theater” can be used for all performance spaces given its derivation from the Greek for “seeing place,” to avoid confusion I will use the word “performance space” for pre-playhouse venues, informed by Gay McAuley’s sense that “the divided yet nevertheless unitary space [where] constituted groups (performers and spectators) meet and work together to create the performance experience, is the privileged domain that I shall call the *performance space*” (26).

⁵ There is a rich and detailed history of discussion concerning Croxton's *platea*, from David Bevington's *Medieval Drama* through to recent analysis by Elisabeth Dutton in *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Drama*. For work on the staging of the Digby play, see Findon.

⁶ See Twycross for an outline of the possibilities (58-60). In Croxton, Elisabeth Dutton identifies that the Flemish Doctor and Colle are located in the *platea*, and that "this implies a relationship between the doctor and his man and the audience whose space they share" (60).

⁷ With twenty-five references, it is superseded only by *Henry VIII* with twenty-eight.

⁸ See, for instance, Kipling.

⁹ The "Records of the Parliament of Scotland" website, for instance, cites parliamentary records of 6th May, 1703: "After calling of the rolls the court of parliament was fenced in the usual form by the lyon king at arms."

¹⁰ See, for instance, Twycross 81-82.

¹¹ A film of the scene can be found on the project website.

Works Cited

"1703/5/6." *Records of the Parliament of Scotland to 1707*, University of St Andrews, n.d., rps.ac.uk/search.php?a=fcf&fn=anne_trans&id=61553&t=trans. Accessed Mar. 30, 2017.

Bevington, David. *Medieval Drama*. Houghton Mifflin, 1975.

Certeau, Michel de. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Translated by Steven Rendall, U of California P, 1984.

A collection of ordinances and regulations for the government of the royal household, made in divers reigns. The Society of Antiquaries, 1790.

Craik, T. W. *The Tudor Interlude*. Leicester University Press, 1967.

Cresswell, Tim. *Place: A Short Introduction*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2004.

Croxton Play of the Sacrament. *Early English Drama: An Anthology*, edited by John C. Coldeway, Garland Publishing, 1993, pp. 274-306.

Digby Mary Magdalene. *Early English Drama: An Anthology*, edited by John C. Coldeway, Garland Publishing, 1993, pp. 186-253.

Dillon, Janette. *The Language of Space in Court Performance, 1400-1625*. Cambridge UP, 2010.

Dustagheer, Sarah, Oliver Jones, and Eleanor Rycroft. "(Re)constructed Spaces for Early Modern Drama: Research in Practice." *Shakespeare Bulletin*, vol. 35, no. 2, 2017, pp. placeholder ref.

Dutton, Elisabeth. "The Croxton Play of the Sacrament." *The Oxford Handbook of Tudor Drama*, edited by Thomas Betteridge and Greg Walker, Oxford UP, 2012, pp. 55-71.

Fitzpatrick, Tim. *Playwright, Place and Space in Early Modern Performance*. Ashgate, 2011.

Gordon, Andrew, and Bernhard Klein, editors. *Literature, Mapping and the Politics of Space*. Cambridge UP, 2011.

Hall, Edward. *Hall's Chronicle*. London, 1809.

Heywood, John. *The Play of the Weather*. *Medieval Drama: An Anthology*, edited by Greg Walker, Blackwell, 2000, pp. 456-79.

Hick Scorer. *Two Tudor Interludes: Youth and Hick Scorer*, edited by Ian Lancashire, Manchester UP, 1980, pp. 153-238.

Ingold, Tim. *The Perception of the Environment*. Routledge, 2000.

Johnston, Alexandra F., editor. *The Castle of Perseverance*. *Computing in the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 1999, homes.chass.utoronto.ca/~ajohnsto/cascomp.html. Accessed Mar. 19, 2017.

Kipling, Gordon. "Theatre as Subject and Object in Fouquet's 'The Martyrdom of St Apollonia.'" *Medieval English Theatre*, vol. 19, 1997, pp. 26-80.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith, Blackwell, 1991.

Lin, Erika T. "Performance Practice and Theatrical Privilege: Rethinking Weimann's Concepts of *Locus* and *Platea*." *New Theatre Quarterly*, vol. 22, no. 3, 2006, pp. 283-98.

Lyndsay, David. *Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estaitis. Medieval Drama: An Anthology*, edited by Greg Walker, Blackwell, pp. 455-78.

Mankind. Three Late Medieval Morality Plays, edited by G. A. Lester, W. W. Norton and Company, 1993.

Massey, Lyle. *Picturing Space, Displacing Bodies*. Penn State UP, 2007.

McAuley, Gay. *Space in Performance: Making Meaning in the Theatre*. U of Michigan P, 2000.

Middleton, Thomas. *The Changeling. Three Jacobean Tragedies*, edited by Gamini Salgado, Penguin, 1969, pp. 259-344.

Pearson, Mike. *Site-Specific Performance*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

The Play of the Weather. Directed by Gregory Thompson, performances by Colin Hurley and Danny Scheinmann. Aug. 8, 2009, Hampton Court Palace, London. Performance.

Pred, Allan. "Place as Historically Contingent Process: Structuration and the Time-Geography of Becoming Places." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol. 74, no. 2, 1984, pp. 279-97.

Sanders, Julie. *The Cultural Geography of Early Modern Drama, 1620-1650*. Cambridge UP, 2011.

Ane Satyre of the Thrie Estatis. Directed by Gregory Thompson, performances by Liam Brennan, Jimmy Chisholm, and Alison Peebles. Jun. 9, 2013, Linlithgow Palace, Linlithgow. Performance.

“Scene 6 (of 12): Scene 6 Diligence and the Pauper.” *Staging and Representing the Scottish Renaissance Court*, 2015, stagingthescottishcourt.brunel.ac.uk/filmed-performances/asatireofthreeestates/scene-6-of-12-lines-1910-2043/index.html. Accessed Mar. 19, 2017.

Shakespeare, William. *King Henry V*. Edited by J. H. Walker, 2nd ed., Methuen Drama, 1983.
---. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Edited by Harold F. Brooks, 2nd ed., Methuen Drama, 1983.
---. *Othello*. Edited by M. R. Ridley, 2nd ed., Methuen Drama, 1984.
---. *The Comedy of Errors*. Edited by R. A. Foakes, 2nd ed., Routledge, 1984.

Shaughnessy, Robert. “Immersive Performance, Shakespeare’s Globe and the ‘Emancipated Spectator.’” *The Hare*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2012, thehareonline.com/article/immersive-performance-shakespeare%E2%80%99s-globe-and-emancipated-spectator. Accessed Mar. 19, 2017.

Staging and Representing the Scottish Renaissance Court. Brunel University, 2015, stagingthescottishcourt.brunel.ac.uk. Accessed Mar. 19, 2017.

Staging the Henrician Court. Oxford Brookes University, 2011, stagingthehenriciancourt.brookes.ac.uk. Accessed Mar. 19, 2017.

Stock, Paul, editor. *The Uses of Space in Early Modern History*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Tuan, Yi-Fu. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. U of Minnesota P, 2003.

Twycross, Meg. “The Theatricality of Medieval English Plays.” *The Cambridge Companion to Medieval English Theatre*, edited by Richard Beadle, Cambridge UP, 1994, pp. 37-84.

Walker, Greg. “Reflections on Staging Sir David Lyndsay’s *Satire of the Three Estates* at Linlithgow Palace, June 2013.” *Scottish Literary Review*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2013, pp. 1-22.

Weimann, Robert. *Author’s Pen and Actor’s Voice: Playing and Writing in Shakespeare’s Theatre*. Cambridge UP, 2000.

Wright, Clare. “Ontologies of Play: Reconstructing the Relationship between Audience and Act in Early English Drama.” *Shakespeare Bulletin*, vol. 35, no. 2, 2017, pp. placeholder ref.

Youth. Two Tudor Interludes: Youth and Hick Scorer, edited by Ian Lancashire, Manchester UP, 1980, pp. 99-152.